



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,239	09/12/2003	David D. Brandt	03AB014A/ALBRP303USA	6849
7590		12/12/2007		
Susan M. Donahue				
Rockwell Automation				
704-P, IP Department				
1201 South 2nd Street				
Milwaukee, WI 53204				
			EXAMINER	
			PHAM, THOMAS K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2121	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/661,239	BRANDT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas K. Pham	2121	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

1. This is in response to the request for continued examination filed 10/31/2007.
2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, and 3-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Quotations of U.S. Code Title 35

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The claims and only the claims form the metes and bounds of the invention. "Office personnel are to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55; 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ541, 550-551 (CCPA 1969)" (MPEP p2100-8, c 2, I 45-48; p 2100-9, c 1, I 1-4). The Examiner has full latitude to interpret each claim in the broadest reasonable sense. The Examiner will reference prior art using terminology familiar to one of ordinary skill in the art. Such an approach is broad in concept and can be either explicit or implicit in meaning.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. Claims 1, 5-7, 9, 10, 20, 23-25, and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,421,571 ("Spriggs") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,539,906 ("Abraham").

Regarding claim 1

Spriggs teaches *"an automation security system, comprising: an asset component that defines an industrial automation device"* (see C 3 L 20-24 "asset management system for protecting and managing industrial plant assets"); *"an access component that defines a security attribute associated with the industrial automation device"* (see C 14 L 20-39 and C 27 L 64 to C 28 L 1-2 "settings security based on each user associates with different instrumentations of the industrial plant"); *"and a security component that regulates access to the industrial automation device based upon the security attribute"* (see C 28 L 2-4 "a security manager module 222 regulates

access to the control and configuration of devices such as a portable system or an on-line system based upon security attribute of each user”).

Spriggs does not specifically disclose the security attribute including a location attribute.

However, Abraham teaches granting security access to users based on status and locations of the users (e.g. col. 3 in particularly lines 17-25).

Spriggs and Abraham are analogous art because they are in the same field of endeavor of controlling assets and security of industrial processes.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the security feature based on locations of Abraham with the teaching of Spriggs to provide an improve data security control for a data processing system. The claim would have been obvious is that a method of enhancing a particular class of devices (methods, or products) was made part of the ordinary capacities of one skilled in the art based upon the teaching of such improvement in other situations (KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.).

Regarding claim 20

Spriggs teaches “*an automation security system, comprising: a server that manages a network interface between networked industrial automation devices and other devices attempting access to the networked industrial automation devices*” (see C 3 L 20-24 and L 31-57 “asset management system for protecting and managing industrial plant assets on a network”); “*a security management module associated with the network interface that enforces an enterprise wide policy and that manages security threats directed to the networked industrial automation devices*” (see C 14 L 20-39 and C 27 L 64 to C 28 L 1-4 “a security manager module 222 enforces security settings for system 10. The security settings are based on each user to access

Art Unit: 2121

different instrumentations of the industrial plant such as a portable system or an on-line system”).

Spriggs does not specifically disclose the enterprise wide policy including a location attribute.

However, Abraham teaches granting security access to users based on status and locations of the users (e.g. col. 3 in particularly lines 17-25).

Spriggs and Abraham are analogous art because they are in the same field of endeavor of controlling assets and security of industrial processes.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the security feature based on locations of Abraham with the teaching of Spriggs to provide an improve data security control for a data processing system. The claim would have been obvious is that a method of enhancing a particular class of devices (methods, or products) was made part of the ordinary capacities of one skilled in the art based upon the teaching of such improvement in other situations (KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.).

Regarding claim 24

Spriggs teaches “*an automation security methodology, comprising: electronically analyzing an industrial automation device*” (see C 3 L 20-24 and L 31-57 “asset management system for protecting and managing industrial plant assets on a network”); “*programmatically modeling the industrial automation device in accordance with network security considerations*” (see C 6 L 55-61); “*and automatically developing a security framework for an automation system based in part on the modeling of the industrial automation device and a network access type*” (see C 14 L 20-39 and C 27 L 64 to C 28 L 1-4 “a security manager module 222 enforces security settings for

system 10. The security settings are based on each user to access different instrumentations of the industrial plant such as a portable system or an on-line system”).

Spriggs does not specifically disclose the network considerations include a location attribute.

However, Abraham teaches granting security access to users based on status and locations of the users (e.g. col. 3 in particularly lines 17-25).

Spriggs and Abraham are analogous art because they are in the same field of endeavor of controlling assets and security of industrial processes.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the security feature based on locations of Abraham with the teaching of Spriggs to provide an improve data security control for a data processing system. The claim would have been obvious is that a method of enhancing a particular class of devices (methods, or products) was made part of the ordinary capacities of one skilled in the art based upon the teaching of such improvement in other situations (KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.).

Regarding claim 28

Spriggs teaches “*an automated security system for an automation control environment, comprising: means for defining one or more security attributes associated with at least one network request*” (see C 3 L 20-24 and L 31-57 “asset management system for protecting and managing industrial plant assets on a network”); “*means for processing the one or more security attributes*” (see C 14 L 20-39 and C 27 L 64 to C 28 L 2 “settings security based on each user for accessing different instrumentations of the industrial plant”); “*means for automatically determining which network devices require security resources*” (see C 17 L 11-18); “*means for*

Art Unit: 2121

controlling access to at least one of a network device and an industrial automation component based in part on the one or more security attributes” (see C 28 L 2-4 “a security manager module 222 regulates access to the control and configuration of devices such as a portable system or an on-line system based upon security attribute of each user”).

Spriggs does not specifically disclose the security attributes include a location attribute.

However, Abraham teaches granting security access to users based on status and locations of the users (e.g. col. 3 in particularly lines 17-25).

Spriggs and Abraham are analogous art because they are in the same field of endeavor of controlling assets and security of industrial processes.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the security feature based on locations of Abraham with the teaching of Spriggs to provide an improve data security control for a data processing system. The claim would have been obvious is that a method of enhancing a particular class of devices (methods, or products) was made part of the ordinary capacities of one skilled in the art based upon the teaching of such improvement in other situations (KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.).

Regarding claim 29

Spriggs teaches *“a security schema for a factory automation system, comprising: a first data field that describes industrial automation devices”* (see C 3 L 20-24 and L 31-57 “asset management system for protecting and managing industrial plant assets on a network”); *“a second data field that describes security parameters for the industrial automation devices”* (see C 14 L 20-39 and C 27 L 66 to C 28 L 1-2 “settings security based on each user for accessing different instrumentations of the industrial plant”); *“and a schema that associates the first and*

second data fields, the schema employed to limit access to the industrial automation devices based upon the security parameters" (see C 28 L 2-4 "a security manager module 222 regulates access to the control and configuration of devices such as a portable system or an on-line system based upon security attribute of each user").

Spriggs does not specifically disclose the security parameter including a location attribute.

However, Abraham teaches granting security access to users based on status and locations of the users (e.g. col. 3 in particularly lines 17-25).

Spriggs and Abraham are analogous art because they are in the same field of endeavor of controlling assets and security of industrial processes.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the security feature based on locations of Abraham with the teaching of Spriggs to provide an improve data security control for a data processing system. The claim would have been obvious is that a method of enhancing a particular class of devices (methods, or products) was made part of the ordinary capacities of one skilled in the art based upon the teaching of such improvement in other situations (KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.).

Regarding claim 5

Spriggs teaches the asset component describes at least one of factory components and groupings, the factory components are at least one of sensors, actuators, controllers, I/O modules,

Art Unit: 2121

communications modules, and human-machine interface (HMI) devices (see C 3 L 45-52 and C 7 L 2-5).

Regarding claim 6

Spriggs teaches the groupings include factory components that are grouped into at least one of machines, machines grouped into lines, and lines grouped into facilities (see C 3 L 53-57).

Regarding claim 7

Spriggs teaches the groupings have associated severity attributes such as at least one of risk and security incident cost (see C 4 L 31-37).

Regarding claim 8

Spriggs and Abraham do not specifically teach an ISA S95 Model for Enterprise to Control System integration to integrate security aspects across or within respective groupings. “Official Notice” is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing an ISA S95 Model for Enterprise to Control System integration to integrate security aspects across or within respective groupings is well known and expected in the art. U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0014500 to Schleiss et al. discloses a preferred flow of communication between various process control and information technology systems are typically found within an enterprise defined by an ISA S95 model international standard (see paragraphs 7 and 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the ISA S95 model for Enterprise to Control system to Spriggs because it would provide for interacting between production or process control systems, enterprise resource planning systems and manufacturing execution systems to facilitate the integration of these systems.

Regarding claim 9

Art Unit: 2121

Spriggs teaches a set of generic IT components and specifies parameters to assemble and configure the IT components to achieve flexible access to the industrial automation device (see C 6 L 55-61).

Regarding claim 10

Spriggs teaches the IT components include at least one of switches with virtual local area network (VLAN) capability, routers with access list capability, firewalls, virtual private network (VPN) termination devices, intrusion detection systems, AAA servers, configuration tools, and monitoring tools (see C 7 L 26-44).

Regarding claim 23

Spriggs teaches at least one of: an authentication with the one or more servers to establish a secure link; a secure link to authenticate and authorize access to a requestor of the networked industrial automation device; and establishment of a secure session with the requestor if access is authorized (see C 3 L 45-52 and C 7 L 2-5).

Regarding claim 25

Spriggs teaches analyzing one or more security attributes to determine whether access should be granted to the one or more industrial automation assets (see C 3 L 20-25).

Regarding claim 27

Spriggs teaches at least one of: determining whether to grant access to the one or more automation assets; granting access from the industrial automation device; and granting access from the industrial automation device; and granting access from a network device associated with the industrial automation device (see C 27 L 65 to C 28 L 6).

7. Claims 3, 4, 11-19, 21, 22, 26, and 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spriggs in view Abraham and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0034774 ("Le Saint").

Regarding claims 3, 4, 26 and 30

Spriggs does not specifically discuss the security component is based on at least one of a formal threat analysis, a vulnerability analysis, a factory topology mapping and an attack tree analysis; the security component is based on at least one of automation and process control security, cryptography, and Authentication/Authorization/Accounting (AAA).

However, Le Saint teaches the security component is based on at least one of a formal threat analysis, a vulnerability analysis, a factory topology mapping and an attack tree analysis (see paragraph 48); the security component is based on at least one of automation and process control security, cryptography, and Authentication/Authorization/Accounting (AAA) (see paragraph 13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the security attributes and security component of Le Saint with the system of Spriggs because it would provide for the purpose of enforcing control aspect stated in the attributes including security policies and delegated privilege state.

Regarding claims 11-22 and 31-33

Spriggs does not specifically disclose security parameters and policies that are developed for physical and electronic security for various component types; at least one of security protection levels, identification entry capabilities, integrity algorithms, and privacy algorithms; the security component includes at least one of authentication software, virus detection, intrusion detection,

Art Unit: 2121

authorization software, attack detection, protocol checker, and encryption software; at least one of acts as an intermediary between an access system and one or more automation components, and facilitates communications between the access system and the one or more automation components; the security attributes are specified as part of a network request to gain access to the one or more factory assets, the security attributes included in at least one of a group, set, subset, and class; the security component employs at least one authentication procedure and an authorization procedure to process the network request; one or more security protocols including at least one of Internet Protocol Security (IPSec), Kerberos, Diffie-Hellman exchange, Internet Key Exchange (IKE), digital certificate, pre-shared key, and encrypted password, to process the network request; at least one of an access key and a security switch to control network access to a device or network; the access key further comprises at least one of time, location, batch, process, program, calendar, GPS (Global Positioning Information) to specify local and wireless network locations, to control access to the device or network; the security management module at least one of schedules audits, establishes a security policy, applies the policy from a single or distributed console, and generates reports that identify potential weaknesses in security; the security management module provides an interface to at least one of add, delete and modify security rights of an individual, a group, or a device and distribute security information to various controllers and control devices; a response schema to provide status to a requesting network device; the response schema including at least one of a status field, a time field, an access type field, an access location field, and a key field, an attachment field to indicate other security data follows the response schema.

However, Le Saint teaches security parameters and policies that are developed for physical and electronic security for various component types (see paragraph 50); at least one of security protection levels, identification entry capabilities, integrity algorithms, and privacy algorithms (see paragraph 50); the security component includes at least one of authentication software, virus detection, intrusion detection, authorization software, attack detection, protocol checker, and encryption software (see paragraph 52); at least one of the industrial automation devices acts as an intermediary between an access system and one or more automation components, and facilitates communications between the access system and the one or more automation components (see paragraph 52); the security attributes are specified as part of a network request to gain access to the one or more factory assets, the security attributes included in at least one of a group, set, subset, and class; the security component employs at least one authentication procedure and an authorization procedure to process the network request (see paragraph 57); one or more security protocols including at least one of Internet Protocol Security (IPSec), Kerberos, Diffie-Hellman exchange, Internet Key Exchange (IKE), digital certificate, pre-shared key, and encrypted password, to process the network request (see paragraph 54); at least one of an access key and a security switch to control network access to a device or network; the access key further comprises at least one of time, location, batch, process, program, calendar, GPS (Global Positioning Information) to specify local and wireless network locations, to control access to the device or network (see paragraph 57); the security management module at least one of schedules audits, establishes a security policy, applies the policy from a single or distributed console, and generates reports that identify potential weaknesses in security; the security management module provides an interface to at least one of add, delete and modify

Art Unit: 2121

security rights of an individual, a group, or a device and distribute security information to various controllers and control devices (see paragraph 60); a response schema to provide status to a requesting network device; the response schema including at least one of a status field, a time field, an access type field, an access location field, and a key field, an attachment field to indicate other security data follows the response schema (see paragraph 63).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the security system of Le Saint with the system of Spriggs because it would provide for the purpose of enforcing control aspect stated in the attributes including security policies and delegated privilege state.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner *Thomas Pham*; whose telephone number is (571) 272-3689, Monday - Friday from 7:30 AM - 4:00 PM EST or contact Supervisor *Mr. David Vincent* at (571) 272-3080.

Any response to this office action should be mailed to: **Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria VA 22313-1450**. Responses may also be faxed to the **official fax number (571) 273-8300**.

Thomas Pham
Primary Examiner

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Thy Pham', written in a cursive style.

December 6, 2007